DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 865 EA 011 617

AUTHOR Wiggins, Thomas; Blood, Ronald
TITLE Values in Educational Administrator Training: The Delusion of Culture Free Models.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consultation Programs; Educational Administration; Educational Philosophy; Ethnocentrism; Foreign Countries; Intercultural Programs; *International Educational Exchange; *International Programs; Social Values; *Technical Assistance

ABSTRACT

In the past, American educational consultants have attempted to export American educational philosophy and procedures to other countries largely without regard to the specific needs or problems of these countries. Although these consultants regard the knowledge they share as scientific and technical and thus culture- and value-free, it is often culture-bound and value-laden. The products we have marketed in the international education marketplace have political or economic implications often to our benefit but less often of benefit to those in other countries. However, it is becoming increasingly apparent to those who have taught in other nations that the current assumption of the generalizability of our educational models is both morally wrong and scientifically primitive. Effective programs of technical assistance in international affairs rest upon an awareness and appreciation of the diversities of life in the nations to which assistance is directed. Ensuring greater success in international education necessitates establishing and ensuring a continuing contact and dialogue with other nations in general and with our colleagues in other nations in particular. Success also depends on a continuing examination of our underlying assumptions, paradigms, and resultant processes in educational administration to ensure their relativity to the world community. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170865

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VALUES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING: THE DELUSION OF CULTURE FREE MODELS

by

Thomas Wiggins
University of Oklahoma

Ronald Blood
University of New Mexico

Presentation at a Symposium of the

American Educational Research Association

April 8-12, 1979

San Francisco, California

EA 011 617

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Wiggins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction

World events as a result of World War II thrust the United States into an assumed posture of leadership with other nations of the world. We viewed ourselves as political, economic, and social benevolents assuming the right and responsibility to proselytize among the other nations. As bearers of Western civilization we began to proliferate in nearly every part of the world. The diffusion of Western values began to have an effect upon the process of modernization throughout the world (Butts, 1967).

The United States was not prepared by experience or precedent to assume world leadership. We were virtually without tested policy guidelines. We were and still are novices in the international arena, and we are still in the learning stage of our assumed posture as a world power. Educationally, our international experiences are largely limited to pre and post World War II missionary efforts and small-scale colonialism. To extrapolate these experiences into national policies regarding advising and assisting in the development of educational systems of other nations is at best naive. The United States did not build bodies of knowledge about the political, economic, and social domains of the nations with which we have become involved. Education, United States style, became a product we exported with little consideration of the unique nature of and differences in the value structures of the nations we aspired to assist.

Further, knowledge about human behavior and its methods of acquisition are not comparable to our material exports which are traded upon the international market place. The dissemination and acquisition of such knowledge is inextricably interwoven into the fabric of culture and, thus, are associated with the value domain of the culture it represents. Failure to recognize

this has yielded results of United States' efforts to assist developing nations as imperalistic, colonialistic gestures of the strong over the weak (Carnoy, 1974; Memmi, 1969). This is an image and a behavior we can no longer afford in a modern world where international collaboration is imperative. Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly apparent to those of us who have lived and taught in other nations that the current assumption of the generalizability of our educational models is both morally wrong and scientifically primitive.

Indeed as one examines the programs we have attempted to export from time to time to Latin America one cannot help but note the strong correlation between the popularity of program thrusts current in the United States and those we choose to export. When the United States is emphasizing school district decentralization as an organizational response to our own peculiar problems we find decentralization being exported to Latin America. When the United States was emphasizing the mid school to resolve population curve changes in our own society, we find the Agency for International Development (AID) funding the exportation of the mid school. When the comprehensive high school was perceived as an effective solution to our own societal problems we exported the comprehensive high school. Proposal writers and AID project developers appear to have a strong propensity to utilize whatever terms and concepts are currently "hot" in this country as a pragmatic way to get proposals funded.

What seems eminently obvious is that the educational problems faced by Latin American countries are frequently not the same as those faced by our own country at any one particular point in time. Sector analyses appear to be strongly shaped by concepts created and constructed to analyze current

problems in this country and the recommendations oddly resemble those solutions which are currently being applied in the United States.

Effective programs of technical assistance in international affairs rest upon an awareness and appreciation of the diversities of life in the nations to which assistance is directed. Assistance programs which transcend charity are sustained by an awareness of both the unique and common aspects of nations. Education is the critical domain in which to foster and demonstrate such international-mindedness. Effective technical assistance necessitates that education assume the responsibility of developing a comparative approach to the study of education. A significant aspect of this responsibility can be addressed through a comprehensive and robust cross-cultural analysis of education. This aspiration transcends culturally specific technologies of education and approaches what Burke (1965) refers to as "style," i.e., a schema of what-goes-with-what as an approach to the relativity of what works.

The organization and administration of education reflects sharp differences among nations. The character of the plan for organizing and administering education is established basically by the political-economic philosophy of the nation. Thus, nations demonstrate through their educational institutions evidence of administrative approaches ranging from authoritarianism to participative democracy. However, this constitutes a conceptual base which is likely complicated by a current assumption that education is more sacred than secular; that it transcends it cultural context; that it is the contemporary church of the state (Illich, 1970). Parsons (1959) complicates the assumption methodologically as he discusses the "value-science integrate" as it relates to the problem of explaining

the sources of ideological variance. Berger describes the responsibility of the student of comparative administration when he states:

> For most of us, as we grow up, and learn to live in society, its forms take on an appearance of structures as self-evident and as solid as those of the natural cosmos (1961, pp. 10-11).

Although this rationale presents no conceptual justification for the current trend in the United States to export our educational administrative assumptions in the form of assumed generalizable models, it does describe the complexity of a consideration for a comparative study of educational administration.

Our conceptual bases for educational administration in the United States are derived largely from the empirical edification of administrative traditions. Even though our concerns have been, broadly speaking, based upon the spectrum of social and behavioral science models, these models are fundamentally empirically oriented and, thus, subject to the indictment of cultural myopia. The very use of the word "model" apparently pacifies some into a state of justification of the exportation of our parochial common-sense elaborated in our empirically-based theories. This could be in part due to what Conquest (1978) refers to as the "systematization fallacy," i.e., inflated theorizing being treated as though it was established doctrine. The assumption of cultural generalizability even further extends the fallacy.

The programs through which many educators work in the international arena are described as Technical Assistance programs. Tens of millions of dollars are directed at reforming educational programs in Latin America alone through the provision of technical assistance. The name itself "Technical Assistance" calls up the image of a "value free" form of activity. The "technician" who advised a ministry on how to put in place

a large scale generator or who advised a government on bridge or highway construction may indeed be offering "technical assistance." Educators in this country like ourselves have though appeared to embrace the concept of technical assistance and its attendant value neutrality. The authors are less sure that the assistance offered by education advisors is of a technical or relatively value free nature. When "technical advisors" recommend changes in teaching techniques or supervision practices they are also wittingly or unwittingly recommending changes in the basic authority structure of the society. The schools of a society can be said to reflect its basic authority structure. They provide a mechanism for socialization into the beliefs of the rightness of those structures. Advice which alters such basic societal structures can hardly be regarded as technical or outside the value domain.

The recent history of the study of educational administration may account in part for our ready adoption of the technician stance. The thrust of the field of educational administration post "Sputnik" has been directed toward becoming as "scientific" as possible. The UCEA movement epitomized this thrust. Students in educational administration classes found themselves being directed sharply away from focusing on "shoulds and oughts" to attend to what empirically <u>is</u>. The research promulgated in our universities promised singularly to help a field administrator understand what the likely consequences of any one action would be, not what any one action should be; the latter question was for the philosophers. Unfortunately the philosophers were nowhere to be found. Philosophy of education had been replaced by the sociology of education which was also attending to the is's and not the ought's.

In a time of intense social change and conflict, our field adopted a "scientific" stance with its attendant value neutrality. The question was not new. Most modern discussions of the problem usually begin with a citation from Max Weber (1969). Weber develops the schism in "Politics as a Vocation" and "Science as a Vocation," asserting that questions of value - of how one should act are for the prophets not the scientist. A counter point to Weber was offered by Alvin Gouldner (1963) in "The Anti Minataur Myth" - a value free sociology in which Gouldner asserts the impossibility of separating science from values. Our lineage in educational administration seems more aligned with Weber than Gouldner.

One cannot help but wonder if the following description of the university professor offered by George S. Counts (1932) is not somewhat related to socialization as a social scientist.

> The college professor - adopts an agnostic attitude towards every important social issue, who can balance the pros against the cons with the skill of a juggler, who sees all sides of every question and never commits himself to any, who delays action until all the facts are in, who knows that all the facts will never come in, who consequently holds his judgment in a state of indefinite suspension and who before the approach of middle age sees his powers of action atrophy and his social sympathy decay.

The thesis being developed here is that our work in education abroad has been characterized by an embracing of the idea that the task was "technical" and scientific, and hence, that the incorporation of the value domain was not only unnecessary but inappropriate.

In summary, it is apparent that the United States has exported or has attempted to export its fundamental assumptions regarding the organization and administration of education to other nations. In doing so the United States has tended to export perceived solutions to its own problems as opposed to assisting other nations identify, address and solve their own

problems. The question remains: Can educational administration models and practice be transferred intact across cultural boundaries?

Observations

As nations of the world develop in technology, industrialization, and considerations for the general welfare of people, they become more dependent upon an internationalism which fosters the creation and distribution of knowledge. Written materials circulate across international boundaries. Experts exchange ideas and skills. Students travel and study abroad. People begin to perceive their interrelatedness and their interdependence. Social institutions became engaged in the circulation and dissemination of knowledge between nations. International agencies such as the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and various private foundations encourage and support international interrelatedness.

Developing nations find themselves importing far more in the domain of the acquisition of knowledge than is exported. World trade in knowledge seems to flow from the industrialized nations to the developing nations, and there would appear to be strong evidence to suggest an unfavorable balance of payments. This places developing nations in a position of entrapment not unlike the dependency experienced in colonial eras (Mende, 1973; Cockcroft, et al., 1972).

Less industrialized, developing nations are structurally vulnerable (Goulet, 1971). Established values of these nations are vulnerable to the ethnocentric intentions of the exporters of change to promote the conversion of value orientations to those of the "neocolonizers." This becomes particularly evident in view of the ruling political elites in most developing nations which are closely allied with the industrial nations. These elites

frequently respond to pressures and influence for favors even when not in ideological agreement.

The presumptuous tampering with the values of social groups has the potential of cultural annihilation and carries the brand of cultural imperialism. Promoters of international education appear to be aware of such dangers, at least in their rhetoric, yet the impact of their own cultural values imprints their efforts both substantively and methodologically. In the field of educational administration, for example, we export the influence of our experience in the form of our literature, research, and theory, extrapolating it benevolently to the "have-nots." The morality of the "haves" giving to the "have-nots" is deeply socialized into our traditions in the United States. Furthermore, the nature of capitalism is such that it consistently imbues upon its followers the responsibility to exploit domains of interaction, particularly the political and economic. Thus, we go forth armed with our knowledge ready to share; a knowledge frequently culture-bound and value-ladden but labeled as scientific and technical. We market our products in the international educational arena with political/economic implications which are to our benefit and less often of benefit to those with whom we relate. In the most of cases the impact of our products is not even anticipated and benefits neither the giver nor the receiver. We proselytize to convert and reform to our assumed status of superiority. Efforts under these circumstances have failed, are currently failing and will continue to fail in international education. Our benefactors are increasingly aware of our intentions and our failures. Most of us who have worked in international education are hard pressed to produce robust evidence of any large scale success.

On the optimistic side, there is evidence, in parts of the world at least, that the characteristic susceptability to United States blandishments is beginning to lessen. The spread of modern communication in Latin American nations, for example, has done much to erode the frequently complacent foreign orientation of capital cities and governing elites. Nationalist assertiveness, the rejection of foreign influences through economic restrictions which limit foreign ownership of communications media increasingly reflects a trend to value local cultural traditions. There is a pervasive openness to social change and an increasing international awareness in major institutions abroad such as those observed in the reformist Catholic Church. Churches are proclaiming identification with missions which emphasize desired social prestige, criticism of temporal state of flux associated with the social, political, and economic domains of developing nations. It is becoming evident in some countries that reformist movements are acquiring institutionalized bases of power and legitimation, are less inclined toward fulminating revoluntionary episodes, and may initiate changes from within governing institutions under essentially nonviolent conditions.

The leaders in developing nations face a new decade with a general mandate to produce major reforms. The status quo has few defenders. New leaders are coming from middle-class groups (Alba, 1970). Women, peasants, and unorganized labor are becoming aware of their potential influence through populist organizations. Universities have proliferated and diversified. Graduate programs have grown as have independent local research enterprises. Organizations in the field of educational administration, such as ANPAE in Brazil, reflect influence similar to that of UCEA over the development and coordination of professionals in the educational sector. All of these observations suggest a growing familiarity with the modern world. Growing

faith in international experimentation should enlarge the potential scope of policy alternatives.

The above observations suggest that to understand the course of developing nations in the years ahead, it will be essential to focus upon local impirical evidence related to institutional processes. The critical consideration in international education hinges upon an awareness of the tendency toward ethnocentrism and the challenge to establish as the primary responsibility the understanding of the relativity of cultural values, learning those relevant values, and building those value considerations into the substance and method of our educational products.

Assumptions

Although developing nations are fundamentally suspicious of the intentions of the United States, they favor strengthened professional relationships. The nature of these relationships appear to be most productive when problems are addressed collaboratively, the relativity of alternative solutions is considered, and solutions are not imposed. Thus, the challenge is to build relationships outside of the traditional assistance-intervention framework. This would enable developing nations to shape their own futures and define their own interests while engaging in this effort in collaboration with others in the world community.

In viewing the practices associated with comparative educational administration operationally, certain features emerge. Those working in comparative educational administration are most often reasonably well armed with the customary arsenal of knowledge of the literature, related behavioral science theory, research paradigms, and often some years of practical experience as educational administrators. We travel to other nations assuming

preparation to teach, advise, and otherwise consult. We are sometimes able to cross language barriers through knowledge and skills in other languages. We teach, advise, and consult intensively, albeit frequently over relatively short periods of time, but rarely listen and observe. Seldom are robust evaluation considerations incorporated into our schema. We are rewarded, praised, and often envied. Yet, the evidence of our successes is spotty and rarely varifiable.

The literature, theory, and research in educational administration, as well as our methodologies, are ethnocentric. Our efforts in international education are biased if not often imperialistic. We seldom know the cultures even cognitively much less affectively. We do the only thing we can do under these circumstances and capriciously generalize to populations not considered in the construction of our training models. This indictment necessitates consideration of the epistemological nature of our training models and relevant substantive paradigms.

The social sciences provide most of the conceptual currency in which educational administration trades. The social sciences model upon natural order and in so doing establish a sense of worldly equilibrium. This results in a perceived rightness about our world view. That which we perceive is reality. Theories relate on this basis to "common sense." Thus, beliefs and practices in educational administration can be thought of as true or false. Truth is derived directly from awareness of reality, and falseness, or lack of truth, is accounted for by bias or perceptual distortions. The accumulation of the body of knowledge associated with educational administration is a stockpile of truths related to observable experience.

Experience is the potential contaminant of truth. Observations are culturally specific, and when these observations lead to assumptions, the

assumptions become cognitive and technical norms (Mulkay, 1969). Assumptions in turn define the act of research and delimit solutions accordingly. Deviations from these norms constitute an academic violation. Acceptance of the norms of educational administration create a cohesive community of scholars harmonious through intellectual consensus. Our colleagues, clients, and peers in other nations may, but more likely may not, be able to assume eligibility to become communicants. Kuhn (1970) argues that there is a universal acceptance of current paradigms to the exclusion of nonconformists. As we work in international education, we tend to invalidate the experience (Laing, 1967) of those of other nations by assuming our models are universal. They in turn become socialized by our arsenals of knowledge and abdicate, or they rebel and subsequently reject that which we profess. Either condition retards the potential progress of educational administration and international education.

Students of educational administration must close their ranks. The homogeneity of the educational administration community would result in what Mulkay (1972) refers to as the condition necessary for rapid accumulation of scientific knowledge. This homogeneity is a necessary sociological ingredient to establish the medium of trust and collaboration to begin to account for and deal with domains of variance which retard our research and theory development in the world community. A consensus of scientific commitment and investigation is the principal ingredient to the rapid growth of bodies of precise and generalizable knowledge.

When a series of related assumptions or paradigms which are generally accepted in an academic area such as educational administration guide research in that field, these paradigms are "normal science" (Kuhn, 1970).

The paradigms establish the sign posts that we follow in addressing problems. The paradigms are precise, even quantifiable, and in their status of assumed generalizability somewhat temptingly thought to be exportable across cultural boundaries. Commitment to paradigms in educational administration enable us to assume the credibility of the underlying assumptions. In this manner the "normal science" of educational administration is accumulated, reified and deified.

It is in the underlying assumptions of our paradigms where much of our presumptiousness about the culture-free nature of our paradigms originates. These assumptions are most often empirically derived through the quantitative and qualitative research methodologies of educational administration. Kuhn's solution to this problem occurs in science through revolution against existing orderliness and orthodoxy. Such revolutions begin and are fostered by the observation and accumulation of theoretical anomalies, findings which cannot be consistently reconciled by the paradigms. Such anomalies do appear in the experiences of those of us who transport and profess the paradigms in educational administration across cultural boundaries. Clearly, the central issue of heightening the likelihood of increasing success in international education is legitimizing the consideration of anomalies perceived in intercultural work to be reflected back to the underlying assumptions of our paradigms. This is the criterion of scientific excellence in extending the scope of educational administration into the international arena. In this manner new paradigms will emerge and paradigm shifts will occur as anomalies are reconciled. Scientific excellence does not triumph as we continue to attempt to convert the international community to our ways, but rather as we foster a new generation of peers and include the world community in our fields of vision.

Conclusions

Insuring a future of greater success in international education necessitates (1) establishing and insuring a continuing contact and dialogue with other actions in general and specifically with our colleagues in other nations (Wiggins and Lynch, 1977) and (2) a continuing examination of our underlying assumptions, paradigms, and resultant processes in educational administration to insure their relativity to the world community.

The current trend in this country is to view education increasingly as an issue of multicultural understanding and collaboration. This thrust has emerged from the turbulant 60's and has been heavily supported by federal funding. We are now faced with the opportunity to export this multicultural model on an international scale. In Latin America we are sponsoring by State Department policy, programs of bilingual and mutlicultural education. Our own current educational stance toward multicultural education in this country, sharply differs in kind from our own earlier attempts at the "Americanization" of minority groups in this country through schooling. Many countries in other parts of the world are experiencing intense drives toward nationalism. Their populations are frequently incredibly far more diverse in cultural beliefs, socioeconomic status and language structures than our own population has ever been. The authors are not at all sure that we have a good grasp of what the meaning of a thrust toward the exportation of a bilingual/multicultural educational model means for the targeted countries. We have failed to answer as yet, some very basic questions about the administration and organization of schools in multicultural settings in our country where the cultural differences are much smaller than in other parts of the world. We do not know with any sincerity what difference

it makes when a school's population is multicultural. We do not have any clear knowledge about whether specific differences in organizational structures are required or different administrative behaviors are called for. These questions need answers.

Some nations are analyzing their policy foundations, systems, and values from the perspective of internationalism rather than nationalism. This analysis identifies and clarifies the forces which effect well-being and begins to focus upon similarities of human aspiration. As these forces are understood and shared, educators from various nations could formulate and contribute genuinely creative solutions to common educational problems. Historically, this current trend is an optimistic leap from earlier trends which assumed that United States education could be transplanted or grafted, thus gaining the dubious distinction of being referred to as education as cultural imperialism (Garnoy, 1974).

Efforts to internationalize education necessitate a capacity on the part of nations to work together in defining and implementing the management of educational issues. Designs must emphasize cross-cultural considerations rather than simply prescribing American answers, and further must take into consideration that many of the more potent ideas and frameworks for educational reform are originating outside of the United States educational establishment. John Dewey no longer prevails as "the" philosopher of education. Piaget's conceptions of how children learn have high currency. The works of Ivan Illich (1970) and Paulo Freire (1970) provide provocative new ways of viewing the educational process which have had considerable impact around the world, though not in our own country. The impact of marxist educational practices while of negligible impact in this country

now prevail as guidelines for educational practice in much of the world. These practices are little understood and little studied here. We appear to behave as if they do not exist. In South America, educational technical advisors from the United States appear to behave as if the revolution in Cuban educational practice had not taken place. Continued success in the international arena will be dependent upon our ability to learn from and be changed by the international experience.

The promotion of the study of educational administration has grown during the last few decades to include nations in all parts of the world (Culbertson, 1978). Although national leadership has emerged, leaders have often reflected the exportation of United States models. Frequently, the leaders in other nations have been trained in the United States. The emergence and influence of internationalism in the theory, research, and practice of educational administration is slow at best. Jack Culbertson of the University Council for Educational Administration has conceptualized and observed the fruition of an expanding set of interdependent communities in educational administration, e.g., the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, the International Intervisitation Program. Currently, there is a thrust to organize the Inter-American Council for Educational Administration. Perhaps when we achieve success in the establishment of regions-of-nations communities, the time will arrive for us to focus our energies upon the necessary planning for a world community of nations to complete the internationalization of our interests.

In the meantime we must attempt to better understand the challenges regarding the indictments of national provincialism which retard the generalizability of the study of educational administration. Our United States provincialism presents a danger of regarding the problems of other

countries as essentially problems of efficiency answerable by technology - cleaner organizational structures, computer based information systems, and educational specifications for new building construction. Our provincialism may prevent us from raising question about the purposes to which the schools are to be put. Our own educational system has been oriented within our culture to serve individual needs. There are many other models competing with this model and yet the dialogue about them is in hushed tones if it occurs at all. We must broaden the scope of and enrich our research paradigms so as to include our wider pupulation of concern. We must not only admit that our work as researchers and advisors is colored by our own personal and cultural vlaue stances but raise this admission to a level of consciousness so as to more knowledgeably decide which values wo hold about education we are willing to stand by and deem basic goods. As an aside it seems worth noting that few if any attempts have been made to export that which is most distinctive about our own system of schooling, i.e., its structure of governance through lay local boards. As imperialists we have been clearly ineffectual in this sense.

We must be ever diligent in relating our broader, world-oriented research back to the relevant bodies of theory from which it is derived. Thus, anomalies will be detected, culturally specific residuals will be identified, and the necessary paradigm shifts will hopefully advance the knowledge of educational administration to meet the challenge of the emergent world community.

Bibliography

Alba, V. (1970), "New Alignments in Latin America," Dissent, July-August.

Berger, P. (1961), The Sacred Canopy, Doubleday, New York.

Burke, K. (1965), Permanence and Change, Bobbs-Merrill, New York.

Butts, R.F. (1967), "Civilization-Building and the Modernization Process: A Framework for the Reinterpretation of the History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, Vol. 7.

Carnoy, M. (1974), Education as Cultural Imperialism, McKay, New York.

Cockcroft, J. et al. (1972), Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy, Anchor Books, Garden City.

Conquest, R. (1978), "The Role of the Intellectual in International Misunderstanding," Encounter, Vol. 51, No. 2.

Counts, G.S. (1932), Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?, John Day Company.

Culbertson, J. (1978), Educational Administration: Where We Are and Where We Are Going. A paper presented at the Fourth International Intervisitation Program, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Freire, P. (1970), Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Herder and Herder, Inc.

Gerth and Mills (1969), Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, Oxford University Press, New York.

Gouldner, A. (1969), "The Anti-Minataur Myth," Sociology on Trial, ed. by Maurice Stein and Arthur Vidich, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Goulet, D. (1971), "An Ethical Model for the Study of Values," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 41, No. 2.

Illich, I. (1970), The Celebration of Awareness, Doubleday, Garden City.

Illich, I. (1970), Deschooling Society, Harper and Row, New York.

Kuhn, T. (1970), The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Laing, R. (1967), The Politics of Experience, Random House, New York.

Memmi, A. (1969), The Colonizer and the Colonized, Beacon, Boston.

Mende, T. (1973), From Aid to Recolonization: Lessons of a Failure, Pantheon, New York.

Mulkay, M. (1969), "Some Aspects of Cultural Growth in the Natural Sciences," Social Research, Vol. 36, No. 1.

Parsons, T. (1959), "An Approach to the Sociology of Knowledge," In Curtis and Petras (eds.) (1970). The Sociology of Knowledge, Deckworth, London.

Wiggins, T. and Lynch, P. (1977), "The Interamerican Council for Educational Administration," UCEA Review, Columbus, Ohio.